

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company for Review of its Proactive De-Energization Measures and Approval of Proposed Tariff Revisions (U902E).

Application 08-12-021
(Filed December 22, 2008)

DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO THE CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 12-04-024

Claimant: Center for Accessible Technology (CforAT) for itself and its predecessor, Disability Rights Advocates (DisabRA)	For contribution to Decision (D.) 12-04-024
Claimed (\$): \$58,414.28	Awarded (\$): \$58,719.53
Assigned Commissioner: Michael R. Peevey	Assigned ALJ: Timothy Kenney

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief Description of Decision: Decision grants Disability Rights Advocates' (DisabRA) and the Center for Accessible Technology's (CforAT) (see note below) petition to modify D.09-09-030 to require San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) to provide notice and mitigation, to the extent feasible and appropriate, whenever SDG&E shuts off power for public-safety reasons.

B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	February 10, 2009	Correct
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	N/A	N/A

3. Date NOI Filed:	DisabRA: March 12, 2009 CforAT: September 8, 2011, see comments below.	Correct
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling issued in proceeding number:	DisabRA: Application (A.) 08-12-021 CforAT: No formal ruling has been issued on CforAT's NOI in this proceeding. CforAT has established its customer status in other proceedings; see line 7, below.	Correct
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	DisabRA: March 30, 2009 CforAT: No formal ruling has been issued on CforAT's NOI in this proceeding. CforAT has established its customer status in other proceedings; see line 7, below.	Correct
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	See ALJ Ruling in A.10-03-014, issued on October 31, 2011.	Correct
8. Has the Claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	DisabRA: A.08-12-021 CforAT: No formal ruling has been issued on CforAT's showing of significant financial hardship in this proceeding. CforAT has established in other proceedings that participation before the Commission would be a significant financial	Correct

	hardship without the availability of intervenor compensation. See line 11, below.	
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	DisabRA: March 30, 2009 CforAT: No formal ruling has been issued on CforAT's showing of significant financial hardship in this proceeding. CforAT has established in other proceedings that participation before the Commission would be a significant financial hardship without the availability of intervenor compensation. See line 11, below.	Correct
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	See ALJ Ruling in A.10-03-014, issued on October 31, 2011.	Correct
12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.12-04-024	Correct
14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	April 26, 2012	Correct
15. File date of compensation request:	June 18, 2012	Correct
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
3	CforAT		In its Motion for Party Status, filed on September 8, 2011, CforAT requested authorization to act as the successor to DisabRA, and adopt DisabRA's prior filings as its own. This request was made following an agreement between CforAT and DisabRA regarding representation of the interests of the disability community before the Commission. In the Ruling granting party status, issued on October 7, 2011, CforAT was formally recognized as DisabRA's successor, and DisabRA was moved to "information only" status for the remainder of the proceeding. Thus the Petition for

			Modification (PFM) originally brought by DisabRA was sponsored by CforAT when it was decided. This Request refers jointly to CforAT/DisabRA, since compensation is being requested for the work performed by each organization.
4.3	CforAT		CforAT did not file its NOI at the original deadline because it was not a party to the proceeding at that time. CforAT filed a Motion for Party Status and an NOI on September 8, 2011. The Motion for Party Status was granted in a Ruling by the ALJ on October 7, 2011.
		X	The Commission agrees with CforAT's assertions above, and finds that it appropriately requested authorization to act as the successor to DisabRA. The ruling on CforAT's customer related status and showing of significant financial hardship in A.10-03-014 is appropriate, and will be utilized in this proceeding. Thus, CforAT is eligible to seek intervenor compensation in this proceeding.

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION**A. In the fields below, describe in a concise manner Claimant's contribution to the final decision**

Contribution	Specific References to Claimant's Presentations and to Decision	Showing Accepted by CPUC
1. As required by D.09-09-030, SDG&E initiated a collaborative process to develop a comprehensive fire-prevention program. DisabRA was one of the participants.	D.12-04-024 at 5.	Correct
2. On September 7, 2010, DisabRA filed a PFM D.09-09-030 pursuant to Rule 16.4 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. The petition states that SDG&E informed the parties during the collaborative process that SDG&E intends to shut off power when strong winds exceeds the design basis for its utility poles and other factors (e.g., a declared Red Flag Warning) concurrently dictate such action.	Petition for Modification of C.09-09-030 by Disability Rights Advocates (PFM), filed on September 7, 2010; <i>see also</i> D.12-04-024 at 5.	D.09-09-030; Correct
3. CforAT/DisabRA noted that during the mandatory collaborative process SDG&E refused to commit to any plan	PFM at 2-4 and supporting Declaration of Karla Gilbride, filed concurrently; <i>see also</i>	D.12-04-024 at 7.

for notifying customers it anticipates that it will shut off power for safety reasons pursuant to its statutory authority, or for helping customers to cope with statutory shut offs by providing shelter, evacuation assistance, generators, or financial assistance.	D.12-04-024 at 6.	
4. CforAT/DisabRA were concerned that shutting off power without notice or mitigation would place SDG&E's residential customers at serious risk, especially those with disabilities.	PFM at 2-4; <i>see also</i> D.12-04-024 at 6.	D.12-04-024 at 7.
5. CforAT/DisabRA asked the Commission to modify D.09-09-030 to (1) require SDG&E to take appropriate and feasible steps to warn and protect its customers whenever SDG&E shuts off power pursuant to its statutory authority; and (2) state that the Commission's after-the-fact review of a statutory shut-off may assess the adequacy of the notice and mitigation provided by SDG&E.	PFM at 4-5; Center for Accessible Technology's Comments on Proposed Decision Granting Petition to Modify Decision 09-09-030 and Adopting Fire Safety Requirements for San Diego Gas & Electric Company, (CforAT Comments on PD) filed on April 9, 2012, at 2-4; <i>see also</i> D.12-04-024 at 7.	Correct
6. DisabRA and CforAT focused narrowly in their briefing and other submissions on the issues of notification and mitigation. While the petition was pending, other parties raised issues regarding the safe operating parameters electrical facilities such as poles, and certain parties provided detailed information on these issues. CforAT/DisabRA did not participate actively in the portions of the proceeding focused on wind-speed issues.	<i>See</i> CforAT Comments on PD at 4-5 (noting that neither DisabRA nor CforAT took part in the briefing on the windspeed issue); <i>see also</i> D.12-04-024 at 6 (noting that the ALJ requested comments on the wind speed issue in a Ruling dated June 3, 2011, and noting the parties that provided comments in response to the Ruling. CforAT/DisabRA did not participate in comments on this issue).	Correct
7. CforAT/DisabRA's Petition for Modification was granted. The Commission ordered: "San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) shall take appropriate and feasible steps to	D.12-04-024 at 33 (Ordering Paragraph No. 1); <i>see also id.</i> at 32 (Conclusions of Law Nos. 2-3)	D.12-04-024 at 36

provide notice and mitigation to its customers whenever SDG&E shuts off power pursuant to its statutory authority.”		
8. The Commission further ordered SDG&E to submit a report to CPSD in the event that it shuts off power pursuant to its statutory authority. Consistent with comments submitted by CforAT, among the other items that SDG&E would be required to include in such a report is “a description of the customer notice and any other mitigation provided by SDG&E.”	CforAT’s Comments on PD at 2-4; D.12-04-024 at 22 (Ordering Paragraph No. 2(vi)); <i>see also id.</i> at 32 (Conclusion of Law No. 4).	D.12-04-024 at 35.

B. Duplication of Effort (§§ 1801.3(f) & 1802.5):

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) a party to the proceeding?	Yes	Yes
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Yes
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Parties with similar positions to CforAT/DisabRA included Mussey Grade Road Alliance, County of San Diego, Utility Consumers’ Action Network, San Diego Superintendent of Schools, Joint Water Districts, CalFire, and CPSD. On certain issues, CforAT/DisabRA also shared similar positions with various telecommunications providers, including AT&T California, Time Warner Cable, Coxcom, Inc./Cox California LLD, and CTIA – The Wireless Association, California Cable & Telecommunications Association. Additional parties to the proceeding included San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and the California Farm Bureau.		Yes
d. Describe how you coordinated with DRA and other parties to avoid duplication or how your participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party: DisabRA/CforAT were the leading proponents of the notice/mitigation issue; without the PFM, it is unlikely that this issue would have been addressed in any way (prior to filing the PFM, DisabRA was also the leading party to address notice and mitigation through the ADR process). Other parties that supported the PFM generally acted in response to DisabRA/CforAT. As noted elsewhere in this Request, Melissa Kasnitz led all of DisabRA’s work before the CPUC prior to moving her Commission practice to CforAT. Following this move,		Verified; we make no reduction to CforAT’s hours for duplication of efforts with other parties.

<p>CforAT requested (and was granted) permission to serve as DisabRA's successor in this proceeding. Thus, through the change in organizations representing the disability community, there was continuity in terms of the actual advocates. Thus, CforAT and DisabRA did not duplicate effort.</p> <p>Finally, because neither DisabRA nor CforAT had expertise in the windspeed issue, the disability advocates did not participate in the portion of the briefing addressing design concerns, deferring to other parties with greater knowledge.</p>	
---	--

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§§ 1801 & 1806):

a. Concise explanation as to how the cost of Claimant's participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation:	CPUC Verified
<p>D.12-04-024 grants CforAT's/DisabRA's Petition for Modification requiring SDG&E to provide notice and mitigation to customers to the extent feasible and appropriate any time that the utility shuts off power for public-safety reasons. It also requires the utility to report on its notice and mitigation efforts following any such event, to allow for review by CPSD and potentially the Commission as a whole, if appropriate. While it is difficult to put a dollar value on this outcome, the decision recognizes that a shut-off presents a risk of harm, both monetary and physical, to customers and requires efforts to reduce such harm and to compensate customers for harm that may nevertheless result. The value of such protections is substantially greater, both in terms of dollars and intangible benefits, than the cost of CforAT/DisabRA's participation.</p>	Verified
<p>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</p> <p>While DisabRA spent a substantial amount of time on this phase of the proceeding, it was all in response to efforts to work with the parties, in keeping with the direction issued in D.09-09-030, to develop a comprehensive program to address fire prevention through and extended ADR process, and then to force a resolution of the question of notice and mitigation when it became clear that the issue could not be resolved through ADR. DisabRA assigned responsibility for the ADR process to a junior attorney, whose rate is modest. In pursuing the Petition for Modification to resolve the notice/mitigation issue, the attorneys worked efficiently.</p> <p>Both DisabRA and CforAT when it entered the proceeding as DisabRA's successor declined to participate in the windspeed issue, leaving that to other parties while continuing to focus on their primary concern of notice and mitigation.</p>	Verified

<p>In its NOI filed on September 8, 2011, CforAT estimated that it would spend approximately 60 hours to participate in the then-pending all-party meeting and subsequent proceedings surrounding the pending Petition for Modification (excluding the windspeed issue). In fact, CforAT spent only 21 hours on work on the merits of this proceeding.</p> <p>Additionally, in its NOI, CforAT noted that DisabRA had identified issues in its NOI, initially filed on March 12 as follows:</p> <p>“As the issues are identified in the Scoping Memo, DisabRA will address issue one: ‘Whether SDG&E’s de-energization plan is reasonable and in the public interest.’ With regard to the specialized concerns of people with disabilities, DisabRA has identified two key sub-issues within this larger category: (1) the identification of and appropriate communication with consumers with disabilities who would be significantly impacted by the proposed de-energization plan and (2) the proposed evacuation of “medically sensitive” consumers.</p> <p>Based on developments in the proceeding, the issues have evolved over time; however, the basic statement by DisabRA regarding the issues of concern to people with disabilities is fundamentally sound, and CforAT intends to continue to address the disability community’s needs with regard to communication and mitigation, the two issues that are squarely at stake in the pending Petition for Modification filed by DisabRA (which CforAT proposes to adopt as its own¹).</p> <p>This limited focus and the continuity of the advocates representing the disability community, even through the organizational change between DisabRA and CforAT, as discussed above, means that the time spent in this phase of the proceeding overall was reasonable.</p>	
<p>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue</p> <p>Since DisabRA submitted a prior compensation request on November 17, 2009, for contributions to D.09-09-030, the issues remaining have included participation in the effort to develop a comprehensive fire-prevention program in collaboration with all stakeholders, as directed in D.09-09-030 (noted as “ADR” in the time records), preparation of the Petition for Modification to address notice and mitigation issues that were the basis of D.12-04-024, as well as associated efforts such as ex parte meetings and</p>	<p>Verified</p>

¹ DisabRA’s pending Petition for Modification was conceived and prepared under the direction of Melissa Kasnitz, who is now counsel for CforAT. In proposing to adopt DisabRA’s filings as its own, CforAT is essentially proposing to allow Ms. Kasnitz to continue to advocate the same positions she has held throughout this proceeding. Thus, permitting such a transfer provides continuity, rather than disruption. (Footnote in CforAT’s NOI)

participation in a scheduled all-party meeting (PFM), and general participation, which includes activities necessary to follow the procedural development of the proceeding, coordinate with other parties, and effectively participate in all relevant activities (GP). General Participation is also used to identify the limited time spent on the issue of wind speed, such as reviewing filings by other parties, since this issue played a major part in this phase of the proceeding, but CforAT/DisabRA did not substantively address it.

From 2009-2011, DisabRA spent approximately 64% of its time on ADR, through the lengthy stakeholder process, and approximately 35% of its time on PFM, including conceiving of the petition, drafting it, and advocating for its adoption. DisabRA did not designate any time as GP.

In 2011, CforAT spent 2.8 of 13.0 hours (22%) on ADR (primarily attending a stakeholder meeting), 5.1 of 13.0 hours (39%) on GP (including joining the proceeding as a party and reviewing other parties efforts to address windspeed issues) and 5.1 of 13.0 hours (39%) on PFM (focusing on notice and mitigation issues).

In 2012, CforAT spent 2.5 of 8.5 hours (29%) on GP, and 6.0 of 8.5 hours (71%) on PFM.

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz (DisabRA)	2009	.9	\$420	D.09-07-017	\$378	0.9	\$420	\$378.00
Karla Gilbride (DisabRA)	2009	4.1	\$160	D.10-04-024	\$656	4.10	\$160	\$656.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz (DisabRA)	2010	44.7	\$420	D.10-07-013	\$18,774	44.7	\$420	\$18,774.00

Karla Gilbride (DisabRA)	2010	106.7	\$200	D.11-01-022	\$21,340	109.10 ²	\$200	\$21,820.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz (DisabRA)	2011	3.7	\$420	D.12-03-051	\$1,554	3.5 ³	\$420	\$1,470.00
Karla Gilbride (DisabRA)	2011	5.2	\$210 ⁴	D.12-03-051	\$1,092	5.2	\$205	\$1,066.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz (CforAT)	2011	13.0	\$420	See comments below.	\$5,460	13.0	\$420	\$5,460.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz (CforAT)	2012	8.5	\$435	See comments below.	\$3,697.50	8.5	\$430	\$3,655.00
	Subtotal:				\$52,951.50	Subtotal:		\$53,279.00
OTHER FEES								
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Paralegal (DisabRA)	2010	18.5	\$110	D.10-07-013	\$2,035	18.5	\$110	\$2,035.00
Karla Gilbride – Travel (DisabRA)	2010	2.4	\$100	½ standard rate in 2010	\$240	2.4	\$100	\$240.00
	Subtotal:				\$2,275.00	Subtotal:		\$2,275.00

² After reviewing the timesheets CforAT filed, the correct amount of hours listed for Ms. Gilbride in 2010 is 109.10 hours.

³ After reviewing the timesheets CforAT filed, the correct amount of hours listed for Ms. Kasnitz in 2011 is 3.5.

⁴ The correct hourly fee adopted for Ms. Gilbride in D.12-03-051 is \$205 per hour. The Commission encourages intervenors to be exact when citing to decisions adopting hourly rates.

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz (CforAT)	2011	2.3	\$210	½ standard rate in 2011	\$483	2.3	\$210	\$483.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz (CforAT)	2012	8.9	\$217.50	½ requested rate in 2012	\$1,935.75	8.9	\$215	\$1,913.50
	Subtotal:				\$2,418.75	Subtotal:		\$2,396.50
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount		Amount	
	Postage (DisabRA)				\$38.76		\$38.76	
	Printing and copying (internal) (DisabRA)				\$500		\$500.00	
	Travel (DisabRA)	Travel for K. Gilbride to attend ADR meetings in San Diego			\$230.27		\$230.27	
Subtotal:					\$769.03		Subtotal:	\$769.03
TOTAL REQUEST \$:					\$58,414.28		TOTAL AWARD \$:	\$58,719.53
<p>*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Claimant’s records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate</p>								

Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR⁵	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation
Melissa Kasnitz	December 24, 1992	162679	No; Please note from January 1, 1993 until January 25, 1995 and January 1, 1996 until February 19, 1997 Ms. Kasnitz was an inactive member of the California Bar.
Karla Gilbride	July 17, 2009	264118	No.

C. Additional Comments on Part III:

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	Time Entries from DisabRA, including summaries (attached)
3	Time Entries from CforAT for work on merits, including summaries (attached)
4	Time Entries from CforAT for work on Compensation Request (attached)
5	<p>Costs:</p> <p>DisabRA's postage costs represent hard copies of CPUC filings mailed to the attention of the assigned Commissioner and ALJ.</p> <p>DisabRA's internal printing and copying costs, charged at 25¢ per page, were higher than the costs claimed; in keeping with prior Commission decisions, DisabRA is capping its request.</p> <p>DisabRA is unable to locate original receipts documenting the travel costs incurred by Karla Gilbride in travelling to San Diego to participate in ADR meetings. However, DisabRA is providing a copy of a Quickbooks entry (attached) demonstrating these costs.</p>
6	<p>Justification of proposed 2011 rate for Melissa Kasnitz (CforAT):</p> <p>Melissa Kasnitz is seeking the same rate for her work at CforAT in 2011 as was authorized for her work at DisabRA. In D.12-03-051, the Commission approved her rate of \$420 per hour in 2011. CforAT has requested the same rate in its request for</p>

⁵ This information may be obtained at: <http://www.calbar.ca.gov>

	compensation in A.10-03-014, filed on May 3, 2012. The proposed rate, consistent with the previously set rate, should be approved.
7	<p>Justification of proposed 2012 rate for Melissa Kasnitz (CforAT);</p> <p>As set forth previously in CforAT's request for compensation in R.10-02-005, filed on May 25, 2012, CforAT, Melissa Kasnitz is seeking a rate increase for 2012 from \$420 to \$435 (approximately a 3.5% increase).</p> <p>This increase in Ms. Kasnitz's rate for 2012 is justified. Ms. Kasnitz graduated law school in 1992; in 2012 she is an experienced practitioner with substantial expertise representing people with disabilities and with a history of effective representation at the Commission. Nevertheless, her rate has been unchanged since 2008, and since she first entered the most experienced rate range of commission intervenors in 2005, at 13 years of experience, she has received only minimal step increases. Thus, while Ms. Kasnitz has substantially more than the minimum level of experience in the 13+ year range, her rate does not reflect this experience. Of course, more junior practitioners have ongoing opportunities to seek increases as they rise in experience levels, and they have multiple opportunities to seek step increases in each experience range. All that this request seeks is a similar opportunity for the most experienced practitioners to obtain a modest rate increase.</p> <p>Ms. Kasnitz is aware that no cost of living increases have been authorized since 2008 (a new draft resolution addressing 2012 rates has been issued, but no action has yet been taken; the draft resolution does not propose a cost of living increase for 2012, <i>see</i> ALJ-281, issued on June 12, 2012). The increase sought here is different. If an experienced practitioner with 20 years of legal experience but no established rate before the Commission sought intervenor compensation for the first time, Resolution ALJ 267 indicates that the attorney would be eligible for a rate between \$300 and \$535 per hour. A rate of \$435, just above the midpoint of the rate range, would easily be found reasonable for such a practitioner.</p> <p>While there is no directly comparable practitioner to use as a model, CforAT points to Tom Long of TURN. According to the Commission's rate chart, available at http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/NR/rdonlyres/991AE44F-B4CD-4133-A2C0-17BF4C0F849C/0/Intervenors_Hourly_Rates.pdf, Mr. Long's rate was set at \$300 in 2000 (established in D.01-08-011) as an attorney for TURN. Subsequent to that, Mr. Long left TURN and has not had a rate set as an intervenor since that time. In 2011, however, Mr. Long returned to TURN. In an NOI submitted in A.11-06-007 on June 6, 2011, Mr. Long indicated that he would be requesting a rate of \$510.</p> <p>Ms. Kasnitz had a rate of \$300 in 2004, four years later than the same rate for Mr. Long. Based on her experience since that time, a rate of \$435 is reasonable, and CforAT respectfully requests that such rate be set for 2012.</p>

D. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments:

#	Reason
1. Adoption of Ms. Kasnitz's 2012 hourly rate.	After reviewing CforAT's comments above, the Commission awards Ms. Kasnitz a rate of \$430 per hour for work completed in 2012. Ms. Kasnitz references Mr. Thomas Long, an attorney for The Utility Reform Network. Mr. Long works for a completely different intervenor group, and should not be used to justify a higher rate for Ms. Kasnitz. Ms. Kasnitz has 18 years of experience as an attorney, and has participated in many Commission proceedings. The rate of \$430 per hour is reasonable given Ms. Kasnitz's years of experience. In addition, the rate of \$430 takes into account the 2.2% Cost-of-Living Adjustment adopted in Resolution ALJ-281.
2. Increase in 2012 hourly rates.	Abiding by Resolution ALJ-281, 2012 hourly rates have been raised to reflect the 2.2% Cost-of-Living Adjustment adopted by the resolution.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No
B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	Yes

FINDINGS OF FACT

- Center for Accessible Technology has made a substantial contribution to Decision 12-04-024.
- The requested hourly rates for the Center for Accessible Technology's representatives are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
- The claimed costs and expenses are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
- The total of reasonable contribution is \$58,719.53.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. The Center for Accessible Technology is awarded \$58,719.53.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall pay the Center for Accessible Technology the total award. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning September 1, 2012, the 75th day after the filing of Center for Accessible Technology's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at Redding, California.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1204024		
Proceeding(s):	A0812021		
Author:	ALJ Timothy Kenney		
Payer(s):	San Diego Gas and Electric Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Center for Accessible Technology (CforAT)	June 18, 2012	\$58,414.28	\$58,719.53	No.	Resolution ALJ-281.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	CforAT	\$420	2009	\$420
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	CforAT	\$420	2010	\$420
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	CforAT	\$420	2011	\$420
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	CforAT	\$435	2012	\$430
Karla	Gilbride	Attorney	DisabRA	\$160	2009	\$160
Karla	Gilbride	Attorney	DisabRA	\$200	2010	\$200

(END OF APPENDIX)